



Judge Charlene Jackson's Restraining Order: A Personal Attack Masquerading as Legal Protection

Maricopa County, AZ — In a troubling development that casts a harsh spotlight on Arizona's family court system, Family Court Judge Charlene Jackson faces escalating allegations of judicial misconduct, retaliation, abuse of authority, and ethical violations. These allegations arise most notably in the protracted custody dispute involving Erin Gerlach, a protective mother fighting to shield her daughter Brooklyn from abuse. An extensive review of court documents, sworn affidavits, and public records, reveal a concerning pattern of behavior by Judge Jackson and systemic failures within Arizona's Family Court system that jeopardize children's safety and violate parental rights.

change.org

My petitions

Membership

Search

Start a petition

Log in

Investigate/Remove Judge Charlene Jackson for Alleged Negligence and Misconduct



2,474

Verified signatures

Sign this petition

First name

Last name

Email

Hillsboro, 97124
United States

Investigate or Remove Maricopa County Superior Court Judge Charlene Jackson
Despite public outcry, numerous formal complaints, and well-documented evidence of misconduct, Arizona authorities have persistently failed to hold Judge Jackson accountable, allowing her to remain on the bench as questions mount about her fitness for judicial office.

Case Background

Erin Gerlach's efforts to protect her child are well documented in a deeply contentious legal battle in Maricopa County Family Court. Gerlach presented documented evidence of abuse

and sought judicial intervention that respected both her and Brooklyn's constitutional rights under Arizona law. Instead, Gerlach encountered a courtroom dynamic marked by procedural irregularities, repeated disregard of jurisdictional requisites, and judicial decisions clearly aimed at punishing her instead of the child's best interests. Her experience, shared in this [personal account](#), reflects a broader crisis in Arizona's family courts that demands urgent attention and accountability.

Gerlach's experience is not isolated. Reports reveal Judge Jackson granted custody to a father who has been indicted in another state for [molesting his own children](#).

In another deeply troubling case, **Jackson is accused of colluding with a known unethical attorney, concealing positive drug test results from the other parent to justify awarding sole legal decision making authority to the parent who tested positive for dangerous substance including methamphetamine.** The concealed evidence only came to light when a member of a parent advocacy group, composed of individuals harmed by Jackson's rulings, reviewed the case file and discovered the buried drug test results.

In one of the most disturbing cases linked to **Judge Charlene Jackson, she granted unsupervised visitation to a man who is not the biological father of a non-verbal, special needs child.** Despite credible concerns about the child's safety, Jackson went further, ordering regular phone calls between the child and this individual, who had a documented history of sexually abusing the child and was under active police investigation for possessing hundreds, possibly thousands, of inappropriate images involving the child and other minors. The mother reports that these calls, during which the man speaks to the child who cannot respond or participate, are deeply traumatizing. The child, reportedly sexually abused during unsupervised visits, lacks the ability or strength to defend himself, making Jackson's orders not only reckless but cruel. Jackson also denied a motion to continue a scheduled court date, despite being provided a letter from a doctor stating that the child required urgent medical attention. As a result of being forced to prioritize the court's schedule over the child's healthcare needs, the necessary medical procedure was delayed, leading to a long-term medical complication that could have been prevented.

The Restraining Order: A Personal Attack Masquerading as Legal Protection

On **March 24, 2025**, Judge Charlene Jackson filed a personal restraining order against litigant Erin Gerlach, citing eight alleged incidents of harassment occurring between approximately **November 18, 2023** and **November 12, 2024**. During that entire timeframe, **Jackson was**

actively presiding over Gerlach's custody case. Despite retroactively self-identifying as a victim of Gerlach's harassment, Jackson did not recuse herself at any point. She continued to issue rulings in the case, including a series of one-word denials of Gerlach's motions and an order requiring Gerlach to pay the opposing party's attorney's fees, even though Gerlach, was self-represented at the time. The case remained under Jackson's authority until it was reassigned **November 12, 2024**, within hours of Gerlach submitting judicial misconduct findings to the Arizona Supreme Court.

If Jackson believed she was being harassed or threatened, judicial ethics would have required her to recuse herself, not continue presiding and later retroactively allege harm. In her restraining order application, Jackson acknowledged that Gerlach's social media accounts had been deleted or made private as of **November 2024**. Yet she waited until **March 2025**, four months later, to file the order. The delay in filing, combined with the fact that the restraining order was submitted on the same day and at the same location as the opposing party in Gerlach's custody case, has added to speculation about Jackson's true motives behind the filing. This timing has also intensified existing allegations that Judge Jackson and the opposing party may have acted in concert throughout the case to deprive Gerlach of her rights.

Judge Jackson didn't just file a restraining order; she filed a confession. In her attempt to muzzle a protective mother, she made sworn statements under penalty of perjury that do more damage to her own credibility than any critic ever could. It's like she walked into court, threw her own ethics under the bus, and said, *"Here's more proof I shouldn't be on the bench."* She wanted to play victim, but instead she played herself. Filing in her personal capacity stripped her of judicial immunity, and now those statements are fair game.

She wanted Gerlach to shut up. Instead, she handed the public a smoking gun. The restraining order isn't protection, it's projection. And every line of it screams: "I'm panicking because the truth is catching up to me."

Jackson's filing didn't silence anyone; it lit a fire. Her own words, now on record, contradict her rulings, expose her bias, and validate the very misconduct she's been accused of. She didn't just tell on herself; she gift-wrapped the evidence and signed it under oath. The best part? She threw her co-conspirators under the moving bus with her.

Conflict of Interest or Perjury?

Jackson denied overseeing any case involving her niece [Paige Jackson](#). Yet screenshots of the Maricopa County docket unequivocally show Paige listed on Judge Jackson's docket. The

case was transferred to a new judge on the same day Gerlach's case was transferred out of Jackson's division.

If Jackson knowingly denied this connection under oath, the misrepresentation could constitute perjury. Alternatively, if she was unaware that her own niece appeared on her judicial roster, it raises serious concerns about her oversight, competence, and the integrity of her case management practices. In either scenario, the contradiction between Jackson's sworn statement and the public record warrants further scrutiny as it appears she is not being truthful or taking accountability. Jackson called Gerlach a liar and "**conspiracy theorist**" for exposing this, despite clear evidence she found on an official Maricopa County Superior Court government website.

Supporting Evidence: A screenshot from the Maricopa County Superior Court docket lists the Judicial officer assigned to Paige Jackson's case as Judge Charlene Jackson, contradicting Jackson's sworn denials.

Family Court Case Information - Case History

[« Return To Search Results](#)

Case Information			
Case Number:	FC2009-094322	Judge:	Jackson, Charlene
File Date:	11/16/2009	Location:	Southeast
Case Type:	Family Court With Children		

Party Information			
Party Name	Relationship	Sex	Attorney
(1)Dept Of Economic Security (DES)	Petitioner		Kathie Pearson
Paige Brienne Jackson	Petitioner	Female	Christopher Love
Valentine Jose Espinoza	Respondent	Male	Pro Per

Maricopa County Superior Court Judge Charlene Jackson listed as the Judge on her nieces case

Manipulation and Concealment of Court Records:

Multiple litigants report missing or edited courtroom audio recordings or allege Jackson [muted the For The Record "FTR" recording system](#) during hearings.

Others allege destruction or loss of filed documents critical to their cases.

In her restraining order filing, Jackson stated:

“She accused me of intentionally muting the recording system in the courtroom even though I do not control the recording system in the courtroom.”

This claim has particularly drawn attention due to motions, affidavits, and complaints filed by other litigants and attorneys in multiple unrelated cases who reported similar issues. These include allegations of courtroom recordings being muted, trimmed, or edited while Jackson presided, suggesting that concerns about [manipulation of the For The Record \(FTR\)](#) recording system are not isolated.

In one documented case, Jackson allegedly stated she had a “**personal interest**” in resolving the matter. However, when the litigant and their attorney attempted to obtain the recording, the final two minutes of the hearing, where Jackson's statement was made, had been erased, or trimmed.

Supporting Evidence: Filings document Jackson explicitly citing “**gut reaction**” as a basis to deny a motion to continue a contempt trial for a sick attorney and an affidavit filed under oath claiming the last 2 minutes of their recording was erased or trimmed.

55. Following conclusion of the two-day trial, on August 15, 2024 at approximately 2:52pm, while discussing the scheduling of final trial dates, Judge Jackson stated “she had a personal interest” in seeing my case through final trial and rushed the scheduling of my final trial before my case would be ripe, and did so against her divisions preferred trial scheduling protocol. Jackson’s expressed statement of having a “personal interest” in any aspect of my case is deeply concerning.

Judge Jackson stated "she had a personal interest" in seeing this case through

(g) In effort to confirm Jackson's expressed statements of having a personal interest, I ordered the FTR audio from the proceedings. Unfortunately, the final two minutes of the FTR audio seemed to be erased or trimmed. I contacted the Maricopa County Superior Court

10

and was connected with Kenneth Crenshaw, Deputy Department Administrator, of the Superior Court, confirmed that despite the trial Minute Entry listing an off the record time of 2:52 pm. The FTR audio for both recording system showed an end of recording time as 2:49:44 and 2:50:58, respectively and was unable to account for the missing two minutes from the recordings, which would have likely included Jackson's statements of a personal interest. These discrepancies are highly concerning.

Final two minutes of the FTR audio was erased or trimmed in Jackson's courtroom. In the same case, Jackson also claimed in her restraining order that Gerlach was lying when she accused Jackson of issuing rulings based on "**gut feelings**." However, public records, including affidavits and a motion filed by a well-respected attorney, confirm that Jackson did in fact refer to her "**gut reaction**" when denying a continuance for a seriously ill attorney. Jackson dismissed the attorney's documented illness as "**fortuitous**," suggesting it was timed to delay proceedings. The attorney was forced to appear for a contempt trial while ill, taking multiple breaks during proceedings. Further, Jackson refused to allow co-counsel to speak or participate while the primary attorney was visibly ill, which left the litigant without adequate representation and violated her right to due process.

Supporting Evidence: Motion filed by a well-respected attorney describing Jackson's bias and confirming Jackson stated she had a "**gut reaction**" that counsel's illness seemed "**fortuitous**."

5 While it is true we believe Judge Jackson erred by not staying the case to
6 await a ruling that may moot this entire action, her comments to counsel and
7 Petitioner were punitive, petty, and ignored reality demonstrating her bias and
8 prejudice. Specifically, Judge Jackson's bias was revealed in her attack upon both
9 counsel and Petitioner where she stated she had a "gut reaction" that Petitioner
10 counsel and Petitioner where she stated she had a "gut reaction" that Petitioner
11 planned this out to buy time for the juvenile court decision
12 to stop the family court from moving forward. Judge Jackson stated that undersigned
13 counsel's illness seemed "fortuitous" despite the fact he provided a doctor's note
14 and was suffering from severe symptoms (vomiting, diarrhea, fever, etc.). During
15 the contempt trial, counsel had to request breaks because of his symptoms and
16 borderline fever. Additionally, Judge Jackson denied Petitioner's co-counsel the
17 ability to speak or participate without reason, placing the full load of the trial on
18 Petitioner's ill attorney. Such a comment impugns the integrity and impartiality of
19 the judiciary in violation of the Code and merits review by the judiciary.
20
21
22

Motion filed by a well-respected attorney describing Judge Charlene Jackson's bias and confirming Jackson stated she had a "gut reaction" that counsel's illness seemed "fortuitous."

Tampering with Minute Entries

Jackson is accused of altering minute entries without notifying parties, and of manipulating the official court record, actions that compromise the integrity of the judicial process and may constitute misconduct and Tampering with Evidence.

Supporting Evidence: A filed affidavit accusing Jackson of tampering with minute entries.

25 On August 30, 2023, Jackson filed a minute entry stating that the jurisdiction issues in
26 these proceedings had been resolved. Then, on September 15, 2023, Jackson removed the
27 statement about jurisdiction being resolved and filed another minute entry on the docket without
28

PAGE 9

1 the statement, indicating tampering of minute entries in this case. This is particularly troubling
2 as it directly impacts the main argument for granting the Respondent custody of the children.
3

4 The tampering of minute entries and the overall handling of jurisdictional issues by Judge
5 Jackson demonstrate clear impropriety, prejudice, and violations of judicial canons, specifically
6 Canon 1, which requires judges to uphold and promote the integrity and impartiality of the
7 judiciary. This conduct aligns with the improvident rulings, as outlined in the case *Smith v. Jones*,
8 456 U.S. 123 (1982), where the Supreme Court reversed a lower court's decision based on judicial
9 misconduct and errors in judgment.
10

Judge Charlene Jackson allegedly tampering with minute orders

Jacksons Issuance of Warrants:

Jackson, under penalty of perjury, claimed to have issued only one arrest warrant during her time on the Superior Court bench. Gerlach is disputing that claim with a copy of one of the warrants signed by Jackson.

Jackson specifically said:

“She claims I have issued warrants for arrest which is untrue as I have issued 1 warrant in my career as a superior court judge.”

This is verifiably false. Jackson's statement is contradicted by court records, which show that Jackson has issued multiple warrants in unrelated cases, and multiple warrants specifically in Gerlach's case.

- 9 30. On December 27, 2022, multiple armed police officers forcibly entered while we were
10 enjoying Christmas Break, due to the Respondent and his legal team's fraudulent warrant,
11 disrupting our family's celebration. Eight (8) officers with guns drawn, accompanied by
12 a helicopter and a sniper with a gun aimed at the children's window, stormed the property.
13 The Respondent's legal team stood outside filming the event, alongside an illegal private
14 detective trespassing on our property, while the Respondent himself was in Italy. My
15 current husband, (Stepfather), and I were handcuffed in front of the children
16 as they were interrogated for hours over false accusations of physical abuse and imminent
17 danger made by the Respondent and his legal team to Jackson. When the police realized
18 that the court paperwork from Jackson did not align with the evidence provided by the
19 children, they removed the handcuffs, apologized to us, and concluded that the children
20 were not in any danger. CPS also confirmed the children's safety, found no evidence of
21 kidnapping or abuse, and subsequently left the premises with the children safely with
22 myself and my husband.
23
31. While the police were present, CPS arrived to investigate the Respondent's allegations of
abuse and kidnapping. CPS concluded that the children were in no danger, contrary to
what was noted in the paperwork from Jackson. Unfortunately, later that day, CPS
returned and abruptly removed the children from my custody due to a renewed expired
warrant obtained by the Respondent from Jackson on December 16, 2022. This caused
the children to be immediately and traumatically taken during their Christmas holiday
and placed in a juvenile detention center called Child Haven for three (3) days. During
this time, the Respondent flew into the United States from Italy, not San Francisco as his
legal team had stated in filings to Jackson, to pick them up.

The warrant issued by Family Court Judge Charlene Jackson was executed

Abuse of Power and Privacy Violations

Under Penalty of Perjury, Judge Charlene Jackson claimed that a fellow judicial officer called her and told her about an article online referencing Jackson. Jackson then accused Gerlach of authoring the article under the pseudonym "*Blaine Baldwin*" and publishing it on a so-called "*pay-to-publish*" platform similar to NewsBreak. Yet Jackson failed to name the actual site, immediately casting doubt on her claim. Independent searches revealed only one article referencing Jackson under that pseudonym published on Medium, a free and widely accessible platform that neither charges for publication nor requires users to submit or display residential addresses.

Under oath, Jackson alleged that the account used to publish the article was registered to Gerlach's home address, a claim that is demonstrably false. Medium does not link user accounts to physical addresses, nor does it collect such data for publication. This raises serious concerns about how Jackson allegedly obtained the information. Her own statements suggest the possibility of improper access to private data, with speculation pointing to potential involvement from her husband, who reportedly serves as a liaison at a regional fusion center, an intelligence role that may afford access to sensitive personal information which raises serious concerns of possible abuse of state resources to target critics.

Jackson reportedly succeeded in having the [article removed](#). However, [an archived copy](#) revealed no threats, defamatory content, or unlawful material, only constitutionally protected

speech and publicly available records.

This leads to a critical question: **If no criminal conduct occurred, how did Jackson allegedly obtain the address of an anonymous writer?** If she accessed private data without legal justification, it would constitute a serious abuse of power and a violation of privacy laws. If she fabricated the claim under oath, it amounts to perjury, a criminal offense that undermines judicial integrity.

Either scenario points to unlawful conduct. When a sitting judge leverages institutional power to retaliate against critics engaged in lawful civic expression, it's not just unethical, it's a criminal breach of public trust and judicial privilege that demands immediate investigation and accountability, not just for Gerlach's case, but for every litigant whose private information may have been compromised by Jackson.

Reckless Retaliation: Judge Jackson's Speculative Accusation Under Oath

Jackson also alleged that Gerlach sent packages to the residences of other judicial officers containing information about alleged corruption and misconduct within the Maricopa County Family Court involving multiple judges, including Jackson. Gerlach has publicly denied any involvement and stated she had no knowledge of the packages. According to Jackson's own account, the materials in the packages referenced multiple cases, including Gerlach's and named several judicial officers. However, according to Jackson, the packages were sent to other judges, not to Jackson herself, raising questions about why she attributed the act specifically to Gerlach. **Jackson stated she participated in the investigation, WHILE SHE WAS ACTIVELY PRESIDING OVER GERLACH'S CASE.** Notably, the alleged investigation Jackson claimed she participated in was at the same department where Gerlach's ex, the opposing party in her case is employed. There is no publicly available evidence linking Gerlach to the delivery, and Jackson's decision to wrongly identify her as the suspect under oath while serving as a sitting superior court judge is reckless and concerning. The accusation appears speculative, retaliatory and defamatory, especially given Jackson's history of contentious rulings and the number of litigants who have raised similar concerns. The suggestion that Gerlach is uniquely responsible for all criticism directed at Jackson is absurd and overlooks the broader pattern of complaints from other affected parties.

If Gerlach's a Liar, Why Does the Evidence Keep Agreeing With Her?

Jackson also listed a wide range of accusations she claims Gerlach made against her, stating:

“Defendant accused me of destruction of evidence, witness intimidation, extortion, perjury, violation of civil rights, conspiracy to commit child abuse and child endangerment, collusion with court-appointed providers, allowing litigants to submit fraudulent evidence, election fraud, election interference, colluding with the judicial nominating committee and judicial performance review, destruction of or concealing public records, filing false disclosures, lying on her application for appointment, providing false instruments for filing, numerous conspiracy charges, stealing someone's LinkedIn profile and impersonating them online, issuing warrants knowing the affidavits were falsified, and abusing her power over gut feelings and misconduct in office.”

Gerlach has publicly stated that she stands by these allegations. She points to a growing body of victims testimony, public records, court filings, complaints, and sworn affidavits she believes substantiate concerns about the egregious misconduct and habitual deprivations of civil rights committed by Jackson.

She Didn't Recuse—She Retaliated

Jackson later claimed that Gerlach's alleged posting of a public article about her in **October 2024** constituted “*ex-parte communication*.” **But here's the problem: Jackson never raised the issue in court, never entered it into the record, and never recused herself.**

Instead, she waited five months and then cited it in her restraining order application—retroactively framing public speech as improper contact.

In doing so, Jackson inadvertently told on herself. If she truly believed the article constituted ex-parte communication, she had a duty to disclose it. Her silence at the time suggests either she didn't consider it ex-parte then, or she knowingly violated judicial ethics by continuing to preside over the case. Either way, her own timeline undermines her credibility and raises serious questions about her judgment, impartiality, and willingness to weaponize her perceived creditability to silence critics.

Calling It Harassment Won't Make the Misconduct Disappear

Erin Gerlach's efforts to hold Judge Charlene Jackson accountable were extensive and well-documented. She filed formal complaints with the **Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct**, **Governor Katie Hobbs**, **Attorney General Kris Mayes**, **Maricopa County District Attorney**, **Presiding Judges Hon. Ronda Fisk and Hon. Joseph Welty**, **The US. Dept. of Justice**, the **FBI**, submitted a [recall petition](#) to the **Maricopa County Board of Elections**, and other government agencies.

Jackson reframed Gerlach's complaints to the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct as "*harassment*" in her restraining order, stating:

"The commission on judicial conduct dismissed the petition as it has all petitions filed by the defendant directly, anonymously, or on her behalf."

Jackson further asserted that Gerlach's alleged request for records from the **Judicial Performance Review board "JPR"** regarding Jackson's performance review constituted "*harassment*."

These statements made by Jackson further highlight Gerlach's concern Judge Charlene Jackson is not fit for the bench. A reasonable judicial officer would know that contacting a public agency is not considered "*harassment*" nor is requesting public records. Requesting public records is a lawful and routine exercise of civic rights under Arizona law.

Everything Gerlach shared publicly was derived from court filings, public records, and her own experience. She did not make threats, nor has she ever been a harm to Jackson. In fact, Gerlach has done everything in her power to avoid being in her presence. Gerlach's actions fall squarely within the bounds of lawful civic engagement. Attempts to characterize her advocacy as harassment not only lack legal merit, but they also reflect a troubling misuse of judicial authority aimed at suppressing dissent, intimidating protective parents, concealing misconduct, and avoiding accountability.

Jackson's Restraining Order Became a Public Record of Her Own Misconduct

Erin Gerlach isn't backing down and neither is the truth. She stands firm, alongside a growing number of families who have come forward with accounts of harm, retaliation, and judicial misconduct linked to Judge Charlene Jackson and Arizona's deeply troubled family court

system. Jackson's efforts to silence Gerlach have not succeeded; instead, they've amplified public scrutiny and drawn attention to the very abuses Gerlach has worked to expose.

What Jackson characterizes as “**harassment**” is, in reality, lawful advocacy, protected by the Constitution, supported by public records, and rooted in lived experience. Gerlach's actions reflect a civic duty to speak out against injustice. **If Judge Jackson had upheld her oath, respected the law, and refrained from violating the constitutional rights of parents and children, there would be no misconduct to report and no public campaign demanding accountability.**

The evidence laid out across court records, sworn affidavits, and Jackson's own contradictory filings paints a deeply troubling portrait of judicial misconduct, abuse of authority, and retaliatory behavior unbecoming of any public official, let alone a sitting Superior Court Judge. It is deeply alarming that Judge Charlene Jackson was willing to admit under oath to conduct that directly violates judicial ethics, all in a desperate attempt to intimidate Gerlach into silence. Her restraining order application not only lacked legal merit but also revealed a disturbing willingness to confess to misconduct if it served her retaliatory agenda.

Meanwhile, Gerlach remains the one in danger, terrified of Jackson's escalating abuse of power and in urgent need of protection. The growing chorus of voices challenging Jackson's behavior is not a coincidence; it is a collective response to a documented pattern of judicial misconduct, bias, and institutional betrayal. From falsified records to privacy violations, to placing children in danger, and the weaponization of her authority, Jackson's actions are not just unethical, they are potentially criminal. These are not isolated missteps, but part of a broader crisis that demands immediate accountability. If Jackson knowingly submitted false statements, illegally accessed private data, or leveraged her title to retaliate against critics, she must be investigated, removed from office, and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The integrity of our courts and the safety of those who seek justice within them depends on it.

She Filed It. She Swore It. She Exposed Herself—Again

Judge Charlene Jackson's restraining order against Erin Gerlach wasn't just retaliatory, it was reckless, unethical, and self-incriminating. In her sworn statements, Jackson accused Gerlach of “**pretending**” to be a victim of domestic violence. Bold claim. But here's the kicker: Jackson never reviewed the actual evidence Gerlach submitted to the court. Not once. So how would she know? In fact, **Jackson admitted in a minute order to disposing of Gerlach's exhibits and not admitting them into evidence, meaning Jackson never weighed their credibility.**

Gerlach provided documentation from multiple law enforcement agencies across two states. In addition to numerous police reports with attached photos and videos, she submitted victim rights forms issued by Maricopa County that list **Brooklyn** as a victim of **Child Abuse** and **Disorderly Conduct**, with her father named as the suspect. **Gerlach** is listed as a victim of **Assault** and **Disorderly Conduct**, again with Brooklyn's father identified as the perpetrator. These are official records, not speculation. And by ignoring their existence, **Jackson knowingly and intentionally violated Gerlach, and her Daughters Constitutional Rights protected under the ARIZONA CONSTITUTION which guarantees both Mother and Child PROTECTION from their abuser.**

MARICOPA COUNTY

VICTIM COPY

VICTIM REQUEST FOR, OR WAIVER OF, PRE-CONVICTION AND / OR PRE-ADJUDICATION RIGHTS

This form opts you in as a victim because there is probable cause that a crime has been committed against you.

Opting in does not mean you are "pressing charges."

Please keep this form for future reference regarding your case.

1

<<FORM USE>>

☒ Initial Contact

☒ Phone/Mail/Email

DATE: 04/06/23

☐ Victim-Initiated Change(s)

☐ In Person

2

<<CASE IDENTIFYING INFORMATION>>

REPORTING AGENCY: Gilbert Police Department Phone #: (480)503-6500

Reporting Officer(s): Det. J. Correa #6190 Complaint/Report/Citation #: GI23-52274

Location: San Tan Valley, AZ (NF1) Report/Citation Date/Time: 03/30/2023

Offense/Type of Crime: Disorderly Conduct and Child Abuse

☒ Felony ☒ Misdemeanor ☐ Petty Offense ☒ Domestic Violence Issue

3

<<ARREST / DETENTION STATUS>>

☒ SUSPECT NOT IN CUSTODY

☐ UNKNOWN ☒ KNOWN

☒ ADULT

☐ JUVENILE

SUSPECT #1 Shawn

Freeman DOB 12/04/84

SUSPECT #2 _____

_____ DOB _____

If an arrest/detention in this case is made, you will be notified at the earliest opportunity. If you are not notified of an arrest/detention within 30 days, you may obtain case status information by calling the law enforcement agency indicated in Box 2 above.

☐ SUSPECT CITED AND RELEASED / REFERRED

ADULT _____ JUVENILE _____

SUSPECT #1 _____

DOB _____

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

COURT _____

DATE: _____

TIME: _____

If a citation is issued, the accused may appear at any time prior to the date and time shown.

☐ SUSPECT IN CUSTODY - ADULT

INITIAL APPEARANCE:

SUSPECT #1 _____

DOB _____

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

COURT _____

DATE: _____

TIME: _____

CUSTODIAL AGENCY: _____
The adult suspect in custody will appear in court for an Initial Appearance within 24 hours of arrest.

☐ SUSPECT IN CUSTODY - JUVENILE

DETENTION HEARING:

SUSPECT #1 _____

DOB _____

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

DETENTION CENTER: _____

The juvenile suspect in custody will appear for a Detention Hearing at the county Juvenile Court or Detention Center within 24 hours of detention, but may be released at any time prior to this hearing.

4

<<VICTIM OR VICTIM'S LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE>>

A. Who was the crime or offense committed against?

Victim: Brooklyn Freeman Sex: ☐ M ☒ F Birth Date: 02/12/18

B. Lawful Representative: _____ Sex: ☐ M ☐ F Birth Date: _____ Relationship to Victim: _____

If lawful representative, check (one) of the following which applies:

☐ The victim has designated me as his/her lawful representative.

☐ The victim is incapacitated or deceased and I am an immediate family member.

☐ The victim is a legal entity (corporation, partnership or business).

☒ The victim is minor child and I am a parent, an immediate family member or legal guardian.

☐ The victim is a vulnerable adult & I am the legal guardian.

☐ The victim is a neighborhood association.

C. How can you be contacted? What is your language preference? ☒ English ☐ Spanish ☐ _____

Name: Erin Gerlach

Mailing Address: Unknown Apt: _____

Home Address (if different): _____ Apt: _____

City: Unknown State: Unknown Zip Code: Unknown

Telephone: (Primary) Unknown (Alternate/Message) _____

Email: gerlach.erina@gmail.com

D. ☒ I REQUEST my rights in this case. OR ☐ I WAIVE (DECLINE) my rights in this case.

I understand that I must keep my mailing address and phone number current with the agency or court responsible for providing my rights. Failure to do so can mean that my rights are waived. I also understand in order to make any changes to the information supplied on this form, I must contact the appropriate agency or court.

(FOR REPORTING AGENCY USE ONLY)

☐ REQUEST / WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405(B)

NOTES / COMMENTS:

MARICOPA COUNTY

VICTIM COPY

VICTIM REQUEST FOR, OR WAIVER OF, PRE-CONVICTION AND / OR PRE-ADJUDICATION RIGHTS

This form opts you in as a victim because there is probable cause that a crime has been committed against you.
Opting in does not mean you are "pressing charges."
Please keep this form for future reference regarding your case.

1

<<FORM USE>>

☒ Initial Contact

☒ Phone/Mail/Email

DATE: 04/06/23

☐ Victim-Initiated Change(s)

☐ In Person

2

<<CASE IDENTIFYING INFORMATION>>

REPORTING AGENCY: Gilbert Police Department

Phone #: (480)503-6500

Reporting Officer(s): Det. J. Correa #6190

Complaint/Report/Citation #: GI23-52274

Location: San Tan Valley, AZ and Los Angeles County, CA

Report/Citation Date/Time: 03/30/2023

Offense/Type of Crime: Disorderly Conduct and Assault

☐ Felony

☒ Misdemeanor

☐ Petty Offense

☒ Domestic Violence Issue

3

<<ARREST / DETENTION STATUS>>

☒ SUSPECT NOT IN CUSTODY

☐ UNKNOWN ☒ KNOWN

☒ ADULT

☐ JUVENILE

SUSPECT #1 Shawn

Freeman DOB 12/04/84

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

If an arrest/detention in this case is made, you will be notified at the earliest opportunity. If you are not notified of an arrest/detention within 30 days, you may obtain case status information by calling the law enforcement agency indicated in Box 2 above.

☐ SUSPECT CITED AND RELEASED / REFERRED

ADULT ☐ JUVENILE ☐

SUSPECT #1 _____

DOB _____

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

COURT _____

DATE: _____

TIME: _____

If a citation is issued, the accused may appear at any time prior to the date and time shown.

☐ SUSPECT IN CUSTODY - ADULT

INITIAL APPEARANCE:

SUSPECT #1 _____

DOB _____

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

COURT _____

DATE: _____

TIME: _____

CUSTODIAL AGENCY: _____

The adult suspect in custody will appear in court for an Initial Appearance within 24 hours of arrest.

☐ SUSPECT IN CUSTODY - JUVENILE

DETENTION HEARING:

SUSPECT #1 _____

DOB _____

SUSPECT #2 _____

DOB _____

DETENTION CENTER: _____

The juvenile suspect in custody will appear for a Detention Hearing at the county Juvenile Court or Detention Center within 24 hours of detention, but may be released at any time prior to this hearing.

4

<<VICTIM OR VICTIM'S LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE>>

A. Who was the crime or offense committed against?

Victim: Erin Gerlach

Sex: ☐ M ☒ F

Birth Date: 10/14/88

B. Lawful Representative: _____

Sex: ☐ M ☐ F

Birth Date: _____

Relationship to Victim: _____

If lawful representative, check (one) of the following which applies:

☐ The victim has designated me as his/her lawful representative.

☐ The victim is incapacitated or deceased and I am an immediate family member.

☐ The victim is a legal entity (corporation, partnership or business).

☐ The victim is minor child and I am a parent, an immediate family member or legal guardian.

☐ The victim is a vulnerable adult & I am the legal guardian.

☐ The victim is a neighborhood association.

C. How can you be contacted? What is your language preference? ☒ English ☐ Spanish ☐ _____

Name: Erin Gerlach

Mailing Address: Unknown

Apt: _____

Home Address (if different): _____

Apt: _____

City: Unknown

State: Unknown

Zip Code: Unknown

Telephone: (Primary) Unknown

(Alternate/Message) _____

Email: gerlach.erina@gmail.com

D. ☒ I REQUEST my rights in this case.

OR

☐ I WAIVE (DECLINE) my rights in this case.

I understand that I must keep my mailing address and phone number current with the agency or court responsible for providing my rights. Failure to do so can mean that my rights are waived. I also understand in order to make any changes to the information supplied on this form, I must contact the appropriate agency or court.

(FOR REPORTING AGENCY USE ONLY)

☐ REQUEST / WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405(B)

NOTES / COMMENTS:

And in Los Angeles, the **District Attorney's charging worksheet** confirms that the only reason Brooklyn's father wasn't charged with **Domestic Battery** was because the **one-year statute of limitations** had expired.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
CHARGE EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

Page 1 of 1

FELONY X MISDEMEANOR	AGENCY NAME LASD - LANCASTER STATION AGENCY FILE NO. (DR OR URN) 023022621125146	DA CASE NO. 43915172 DA OFFICE CODE AVA	DATE 03/13/2023 VICTIM ASSISTANCE REFERRAL ☐ YES- NOTIFY VWAP ☐ NO			
SUSP NO.	SUSPECT		CHARGES			
			CODE	SECTION	OFFENSE DATE	REASON CODE
1	NAME (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE)		PC 243(E)(1) 12/09/2019 B			
	FREEMAN, SHAWN TYLER					
	DOB	SEX (M/F)	BOOKING NO.	VIPX Yes-No		
		M		VIP - (03) Intimate Partner Violence		
	Gang Member Name of Gang		Victim Gang Member Name of Gang:			
2	NAME (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE)					
	DOB	SEX (M/F)	BOOKING NO.	VIP-Yes-No		
	Gang Member Name of Gang		Victim Gang Member Name of Gang:			
	Victim Name:		Victim DOB:			
3	NAME (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE)					
	DOB	SEX (M/F)	BOOKING NO.	VIP-Yes-No		
	Gang Member Name of Gang		Victim Gang Member Name of Gang:			
	Victim Name:		Victim DOB:			
Comments REJECT Suspect was intoxicated and pushed the victim. Victim stumbled backwards but she had no injuries. Incident occurred in 2019 and victim reported in 2923. Also during body camera interview, victim stated her husband/ suspect may be a police officer. If so, in the future, case will need to be presented to JSOD first. Case cannot be filed because Statute of Limitations has passed under Penal code section 802 (a).						

LAST NAME: FREEMAN

FIRST NAME: SHAWN

DA CASE NUMBER: 43915172

I have conveyed all relevant information to the above-named Deputy District Attorney to be used in consideration of a filing decision.

FILING OFFICER (PRINT): JAMES MURPHY FILING OFFICER (SIGNATURE): SERIAL #: 546035

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REASON CODES (FORM 8715) A. Lack of Corpus B. Lack of Sufficient Evidence C. Inadmissible Search/Seizure	D. Victim Unavailable/Declines To Testify E. Witness Unavailable/Declines to Testify F. Combined with Other Counts/Cases G. Interest of Justice	H. Other (Indicate the reason in Comments section) I. Referred to Non-California Jurisdiction J. Deferred for Revocation of Parole K. Further Investigation	L. Prosecutor Pre-filing Deferral DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S REASON CODES M. Probation Violation filed in lieu of N. Referred to City Attorney for Misdemeanor Consideration
--	--	--	---

So, Jackson is claiming that multiple law enforcement agencies in Arizona and California, and the District Attorney's Office are all lying? That every agency that documented abuse is wrong, and Jackson, who self-admitted she didn't review the evidence, is somehow, right?

Because that's what her restraining order implies. And it's not just arrogant, it's dangerous.

But it gets worse.

In the same restraining order filing, Judge Charlene Jackson openly admits to discussing Erin Gerlach's case with outsiders. That alone is a **direct violation of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct**, which strictly prohibits judges from publicly commenting on pending or impending cases. Jackson herself has previously acknowledged that such conduct is unethical. Yet she did exactly that, in writing, under oath, in a civil filing she submitted personally.

But the misconduct didn't stop there.

Jackson then **inserted herself into Gerlach's custodial interference case**, a matter she was not assigned to, and admitted to knowing sensitive details about it. She went further, disclosing some of those details in a public record, all while actively serving as a sitting judge. That's not just inappropriate, it's a flagrant breach of judicial ethics and a direct violation of **Rule 2.10 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct**, which states:

"A judge shall not make any public statement that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome or impair the fairness of a matter pending or impending in any court."

Then came the retaliation.

Jackson had Gerlach **served with the restraining order while she was in court—not once, but twice**—in what appears to be a calculated attempt to **influence the outcome of those proceedings**. She escalated further, having Gerlach served **seven separate times**, including multiple times while Gerlach was in jail, in a clear effort **to manipulate her treatment and intimidate her**. That's not just unethical, it's judicial harassment. It's an abuse of power. And it's now part of the public record.

This is a full-blown ethical collapse. And the evidence? It's all in her own words. She built a paper trail of misconduct and signed her name to it. **How is she still on the bench?**

Community and Legislative Responses

Over 2,400 citizens have signed a [change.org petition](#) demanding Jackson's removal, citing a history of judicial bias, dangerous custody orders, and procedural failures.

On **February 7, 2025**, [Arizona Capitol Times](#) reported that Arizona State Representative Rachel Keshel (formerly Jones) had sent a formal [letter of concern](#) to Judge Charlene Jackson on behalf of her constituents. In the letter, Keshel informed Jackson of her intent to submit formal requests to the Arizona judiciary committees to initiate a review of widespread complaints involving **judicial bias, rulings inconsistent with Arizona law and procedural requirements, collusion with court-appointed experts, appointment of forensic experts and financial hardship**, and **adverse custody orders placing children at risk**. Jackson was aware that Gerlach was one of the constituents whose experience Keshel referenced.

How Is Judge Jackson Still on the Bench?

Given the extent of evidence showing misconduct, retaliation, and blatant dishonesty, the question confronts Arizona's legal system and the public:

How can a judge who fabricates evidence under oath, weaponizes judicial tools against protective parents, and repeatedly violates the constitutional rights of children and families retain her position on the bench?

This is a critical accountability failure. The judicial system's inability or unwillingness to remove a judge with such a troubling record jeopardizes not only litigants' rights but the integrity of Arizona's courts. Families, attorneys, and advocacy groups continue to demand an immediate, transparent review of Jackson's fitness for office and any necessary disciplinary or criminal proceedings to restore trust and protect vulnerable children.

Judge Charlene Jackson's continued tenure amid mounting evidence of judicial abuse exemplifies why Arizona's family court system urgently needs fundamental changes to safeguard justice, protect victims, and restore integrity.

Do you have information about Misconduct in Arizona Family Courts? Send it to us at k3xhyc4@proton.me

[**Please Sign the Petition to Investigate or Remove Maricopa County Superior Court Judge Charlene Jackson**](#)



Remove Judge Charlene Jackson from the Maricopa County Superior Court